

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1 and 8 are currently being amended.

Claims 15-18 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-18 are now pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph Rejection:

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. In reply, page 16, lines 1-8 of the specification describes an example whereby an input-related job corresponds to a received e-mail, and whereby an output-related job corresponds to a print-output of the e-mail. Note that the output-related job is not executed until a time when the e-mail is actually printed by a printer. Thus, the creation of an output-related job for printing an e-mail is separate and distinct from the actual execution of that output-related job, since the output-related job is not executed until a time when the printer actually prints the e-mail that has been sent to it as a data file.

The Office Action's reference to page 16, lines 9-14 of the specification is noted, but please note that this merely describes an example whereby two separate jobs, JB11 and JB12, constitute a synthetic job. This portion of the specification says nothing about "the synthetic job 'B' having already been executed", since it merely describes the components making up a synthetic job. The 'storing' of the jobs JB11 and JB12 is different from the execution of the jobs JB11 and JB12, and perhaps that is leading to the Examiner's misunderstanding of this

feature. The storing of an output-related job merely signifies the storing of data to be used to later output a job, such as the storing of a data file received by a printer, followed by execution of that data file that results in the printing of data corresponding to the data file. Again, 'storing' and 'executing' are two different things to be performed on a job.

A synthetic job corresponds to two separate jobs, whereby the job synthesizing means generates, according to a user's operation, a synthetic job constituted by an input-related candidate job which has been already executed by a first device, and an output-related candidate job which will be executed hereafter. Thus, at this moment in time, a first portion of the synthetic job corresponding to the input-related job has already been executed by a first device, and a second portion of the synthetic job correspond to the output-related job has yet to be executed (by a second device). A job schedule succeeding means controls the succeeding of the remainder of the synthetic job (the output-related job) that will be executed by the second device, which is a device different from the first device which executed the initial portion of the synthetic job (the input-related job). Such features are clearly set forth in the claims and in the specification, and are well understood by one skilled in the art.

As to the comments made on page 3 of the Office Action regarding "It is not understood if these jobs execute processing themselves, or are executed by the job management means or processor", two or more jobs are combined as a synthetic job, whereby the scheduling of the synthetic job is performed by the claimed job synthesizing means and the claimed job schedule succeeding means. The actual execution of a job itself, such as the execution of an output-related job that corresponds to a print-output to be made on an e-mail, is performed by a device (e.g., computer or printer) based on information provided in the job. In more detail, as recited in claim 1, an input-related candidate job executes chiefly input processing, and an output-related candidate job executes chiefly output processing. Such features are clearly recited and are well understood by one skilled in the art.

Please note that, in the interest of expediting prosecution, claims 1 and 8 have been amended slightly (without affecting the scope of those claims) to provide additional clarification for the examiner, so as to hopefully result in the withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,872,569 to Salgado. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, “job schedule succeeding means for succeeding a schedule from the first device which has executed the input-related candidate job to the second device which has executed the output-related job hereafter.”

Salgado et al. do not disclose or suggest the job schedule succeeding means as recited in claim 1. The Office Action asserts that column 14, lines 10-21 of Salgado et al. for allegedly disclosing the features of the claimed job schedule succeeding means, but this assertion is incorrect. Rather, column 14, lines 10-21 of Salgado et al. merely describes a technique for implementing a metaphorical job ticket/control system with a metaphorical template in a manual context and in an automatic context. Such a disclosure has nothing at all to do with the features recited in the claimed job schedule succeeding means, which succeeds a schedule from a first device (which has executed an input-related candidate job) to a second device (which will execute an output-related job hereafter).

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Salgado et al. for the above reasons.

Further, the Office Action asserts that “an output-related candidate job which will be executed hereafter (printed or emailed documents, Fig. 13)” of Salgado et al. corresponds to the claimed “an output-related candidate job which will be executed hereafter.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. The printed or emailed documents described in Salgado et al. correspond to input-related candidate jobs that have already been executed, and do not correspond to an output-related candidate job that will be executed hereafter.

Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Salgado et al. for these additional reasons.

New Claims:

New claims 15-18 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that provide an additional basis of patentability for those claims. Support for the features recited in these claims may be found, for example, on page 18 of the specification.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 24, 2006
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola
Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819